UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/604,154	06/27/2003	Yong Zhou	GEMS8081.144	1153	
ZIOLKOWSKI PATENT SOLUTIONS GROUP, SC (GEMS) 136 S WISCONSIN ST			EXAMINER		
			HOFFA, ANGELA MARIE		
PORT WASHINGTON, WI 53074			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		3768			
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			01/31/2011	ELECTRONIC	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

info@zpspatents.com rlt@zpspatents.com klb@zpspatents.com

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.		Applicant(s)	
	10/604,154	ZHOU, YONG	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Angela M. Hoffa	3768	

	Angela M. Hoffa	3768	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appea	ars on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 18 January 2011 FAILS TO PLACE THIS A	PPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR	R ALLOWANCE.	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following rapplication in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appe for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	eplies: (1) an amendment, affidavi al (with appeal fee) in compliance	t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Adno event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b) MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f)	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth the ter than SIX MONTHS from the mailing (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	date of the final rejection	n.
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extrunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the slast forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1. ension and the corresponding amount of nortened statutory period for reply origi	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Offic	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compl filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exten Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed with AMENDMENTS	sion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, b (a) They raise new issues that would require further con (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below (c) They are not deemed to place the application in bett appeal; and/or (d) They present additional claims without canceling a c NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	sideration and/or search (see NOT v); er form for appeal by materially red	E below);	
 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): 6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowed non-allowable claim(s). 	·		·
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prove The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: 1,4 and 5. Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: 6-10 and 12-21. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:		be entered and an ex	xplanation of
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 	sufficient reasons why the affidavi	t or other evidence is	necessary and
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to over showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary 	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	l and/or appellant fails	s to provide a
10. \square The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation	of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attach	ed.
 REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER 11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but See Continuation Sheet. 	does NOT place the application in	condition for allowand	ce because:
12. Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). (13. Other:	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
/Long V Le/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3768	/A. M. H./ Examiner, Art Unit 3768		

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant argues that the 112 scope of enablement rejections of claims 6 and 14 are improper since the claimed invention is enabled by the disclosure. However, while the claimed scope includes working embodiments, the claimed scope also includes non-working embodiments as described in the final office action. Claiming non-working embodiments is not permitted. Applicant further argues that the 112, 2nd paragraph rejection of claims 1 and 6 is improper since the rejection was made in light of claim 1 rather than in light of the disclosure. The examiner was trying to determine if the same scope of invention was being desired in the apparatus (claim 6) and computer program claims (claim 14) as for the method claim (claim 1). To expedite allowance, it would be very helpful to mirror the language of what has been determined to be allowable. If a different scope is desired for claims 6 and 14, perhaps consider pursuing these claims in a continuation application. The 112, 2nd paragraph rejection will be withdrawn. Regarding the 112, 2nd paragraph rejection of claims 14-20 for omitting an essential feature, Applicant argues that the feature in question was never admitted to be critical. The Examiner has referenced portion of the specification to support the position of the feature being essential. The rejection also agrees with the enablement rejection of claims 14-20 - that is, the missing feature would eliminate the non-working embodiments and is therefore essential to the working embodiment of the invention. Suggested claim language was presented in the final office action to obviate all issues and put the application in condition for allowance.